

SECRET

26 February 1969

COINS LOG

25X1

1. There was no representative from the National Indications Center. However, they are supposedly still on the <sup>very</sup> point of getting the equipment necessary to put them into the COINS system.

2. Test results: [ ] of the Interface

25X1

Panel gave an analysis of the system tests held on the week of the 10th - 14th February and the post mortem which the Interface Panel held on this test last week. The only days taken in detail were the 12th of February, the only day when everyone was in the system, and the 13th which was an alternate day for CIA. <sup>One</sup> ~~None~~ of the <sup>6</sup> CIA queries on the 12th <sup>received an answer back to CIA</sup> appeared to have been answered.

A chart of the queries is attached. There were <sup>23</sup> ~~30~~ interrogations on the 12th. Only <sup>7</sup> ~~8~~ were successful from the start to finish. Generally speaking, only <sup>26</sup> ~~26~~ % of the <sup>?</sup> ~~overall~~ queries on COINS have been successfully completed. <sup>for John:</sup> Yesterday

25X1

[ ] sent out 35 queries to DIA and got 5 answers.

He has still never been able to reach NSA. There are great numbers of reasons for the query failures. Probably the biggest difficulty was due to a lack of re-transmit capability, both at the switch and with some of the problem computers. DIA is presently debugging a re-transmit routine

Questions:  
Is this the real  
answer? - John  
think so.

SECRET

SECRET

- 2 -

and hopes that all parts of the system will have a re-transmit capability soon. As indicated on the chart, the switch lost a considerable number of queries by sending the query to the problem computer, not getting a receipt but sending it anyhow and therefore losing the query. CIA had some difficulty with software. For instance, a left parens didn't transmit. Sometimes they receipted queries then didn't transmit.

A break at NPIC appeared to the CIA computer as if the entire system was down. Once NSA made a poor format to a query and NPIC couldn't pick it up. Many of these problems have since been corrected by changes in the software.

Generally speaking, NPIC looked the best in the test.

Only one query was lost during the test because CIA went off the air at 10:00 A.M. Nevertheless, George would like the Interface Panel to look into the possibility of building a capability to hold a query overnight on the switch when the system goes off the air.

One of the problems concerning the holding of queries is that the switch can queue up to 10 interrogations only. Originally they thought that once a user was notified, that one of the computers was off the air, they didn't send a query to that computer. However, it has not worked out that way. Users have been making queries and expecting the switch to hold them until the other computer comes back on the air, and the switch does not have enough capability for this. Some interrogations to NSA were lost when the 494

SECRET

SECRET

- 3 -

would receipt the query but not forward the query to the 490.

NSA is also having <sup>as many then</sup> other types of queueing problems. <sup>which caused one here</sup> One

of the queue difficulties is that while the CIA system occasionally gets the receipt, the out-terminals do not,

and the user does not know what happened to his query when it

does not return. <sup>According to</sup> [redacted] It appears that CIA has every type of

25X1

problem -- software, hardware, timing, interface, communication -- 25X1

all to be compounded when they switch over to the 360/67.

Installation of the 67 is still being held up by site preparation, specifically air conditioning. <sup>as of 24 Febr.</sup> [redacted]

25X1

reported that where he had been originally told that CIA would be off COINS for at least a week when CIA switches to

the 67, he is now told that that is not so. The reason why

there will not be a <sup>gap</sup> capability is because OCS will emulate

the 65 during the day and only test 67 programming at night.

However, CIA <sup>may</sup> will need a major software re-write to clear up

the system difficulties. The programmers told Bob that will

take at least a month and they are hopeful that this will

take care of all the problems. He is not quite that hopeful.

The feeling was that the test and the post mortem were a

very valuable experience, so another test is being scheduled

for 10-14 March with an analysis of the test on the 17th.

There will probably be another test from the 24-28th of March.

bringing 27 Feb  
gave 1st week of  
March as time  
for "power up."

SECRET

**SECRET**

25X1

[ ] reported that the user log forms were a mess. People put as many as seven interrogations on one sheet and did just about everything wrong with the form that was possible to do. Many of the user logs were lost in the mail; the only ones he got for sure were the ones that were handcarried. The fact that many of the logs are codeword seemed to be responsible for the mail mix-up. So, the logs for the next test will all be handcarried to the next analysis meeting.

ILLEGIB

*why do they have  
the codeword?*

It is obvious that the user log form will have to be redesigned. For example, <sup>there are</sup> / boxes to fill in for unsuccessful queries, but none for successful ones. George will talk to [ ] this week about forms redesign and the overnight hold on the switching. [ ] thinks that the 27% reliability can be raised to 50% if the switch gets a re-transmit capability.

25X1

25X1

25X1

[ ] said that this will never do; the system will need 99% reliability or the user will clobber the system by not using it at all. George stated that the users are the only people who can force the machine people to improve the system.

ILLEGIB

**SECRET**

~~SECRET~~

ILLEGIB

Dan's opinion was that they wouldn't pressure the machine people, they'll just not use the system.

3. NSA Contract. George had a conference last week with [ ] at DIA -- DIA no longer has any objection to NSA letting a contract for outside aid in some of the communications tasks on the COINS Master Plan. However, George will delay the contract until May or June.

4. New Members of COINS. George is now finishing a paper with ground rules for bringing in new <sup>new</sup> members for the COINS system. He divides these new people into two groups: <sup>b</sup>Suscribers and Contributors. <sup>b</sup>Suscribers are those like State who presently have no files <sup>f</sup>of their own to use in COINS and merely query the system. This paper is written obviously with Unified and Specified Commands in mind. There are some very interesting problems involved if any of these new members of COINS will be contributors because there are some problems to be overcome before we will be

able to interrogate some of these distant files. <sup>At the top of</sup> list of these, of course, are security problems. <sup>(TIP does not understand all implied on this subject.)</sup>

5. Standards. The COINS sub-system managers had contributed written comments to George for his two papers setting up standards for COINS [ ]

[ ] on dates. There were some disagreements on the record length [ ] DIA wanted 28 spaces, rather than 25 that George suggested, in order to bring COINS files into agreement with the new world-wide

[ ] which DIA is trying to establish

25X1

Approved For Release 2005/08/03 : CIA-RDP80B01139A000100020021-8

Next 2 Page(s) In Document Exempt

Approved For Release 2005/08/03 : CIA-RDP80B01139A000100020021-8

Master Plan.) In fact the typographical error<sup>in the CMP</sup> " permit an evaluate" instead of "an evaluation" was repeated in

25X1 [ ] paper. His objectives again were "pretty long-rangy".

25X1 [ ] pointed this out and the difficulty he would have in getting CIA concurrence to any objectives that were not zeroed in on the experiment alone. [ ] agreed with [ ] pointing out that the problem came about through the footnote to the objectives in the COINS Master Plan, and the attention the DIRNSA letter of transmittal drew to it. So <sup>they</sup> ~~that~~ started on Young's objectives again because George wanted some agreement on a couple of objectives today. Everyone agreed that Young's objective #2 is essentially the same as the one in the COINS Master Plan. It was finally decided that each manager would write up each of Bob's objectives (1) a,b,c,d,e, & (2) with the "Measurement of Objective Achievement" & the "Determination of Success or Failure" as they had done on their own #1 objective, and we'll meet next week to discuss this.

The meeting will be held Wednesday, 5 March, at NPIC at 10 a.m.

JOE:pw

SECRET